4.—Sri M. V. KRISHNAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—

Taluk		*No of wells taken up*
Dharwar	...	53
Hubli	...	61
Kalghatgi	...	77
Navalgund	...	2
Kundgol	...	36
Hangal	...	128
Shiggaon	...	274
Shirhatti	...	144
Hirekerur	...	265
Byadgi	...	190
Ranebenur	...	395
Godag	...	228
Ron	...	374
Mundargi	...	343
Nargund	...	86
Haveri	...	242
Total	...	2,868

ARREST AND RELEASE OF A MEMBER

Announcement

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received a communication from the Superintendent of Police, Bangalore, Camp Ramanagaram, that Sri S. Gopal Gowda, Member, Legislative Assembly, was arrested at 7-15 P.M. on 20th July at Ramanagaram and released at 9-15 P.M. on the same day.

Members' Representation

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—An adjournment motion was given notice of.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have got a number of them. The member may kindly tell me the one which he has got in his mind ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—It is the one connected with the opening of fire at Davanagere and Harihar. I have sent a notice for adjournment of the House to discuss the matter arising out of the firing that took place at Davanagere and Harihar.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The requirements of the rules are fulfilled. Has the Government got anything to say with regard to it ?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home).—I understand that there is also a Call Attention Notice in respect of the same matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Has it been posted for today? Who was given notice of it?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Sri A. J. Doddameti appears to have given it. The position is that Cases have been registerd and nine reports have been launched with the Courts and charge-sheets have been filed in one or two cases. The entire thing is before the Court. Now it would not be possible to discuss matters which are before the Court.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member means to tell that it is *sub judice* and that *subjudice* matters should not be discussed on the floor of the House?

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—That portion of the affair which is *subjudice* need not be discussed here; I mean those which are going to form the subject matter of judicial enquiry. But the other affairs leading to the firing, prior to the firing, which are not covered by the courts bnt covered by the Police, can be discussed. *sub-judice* is a very comprehensive term and under that it would not be fair to altogether shut out discussion on the subject itself.

†Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—The Hon'ble Minister says: cases have been launched. Now, let us not confuse the two issues. One is the cases might have been launched against some of the demonstrators, which has absolutely no relevance to the point that I have raised in my adjournment motion. My adjournment motion deals specifically with the facts arising out of the firing by the Police against unarmed demonstrators. Now, at this rate, every time there is a firing, the Government can always say that the matter is before the Court of Law and that it cannot be raised. Then the whole Rules 50, 51 and 52 of these provisions become superfluous. Now, the prerogative rests with the Speaker. If you are convinced that this is a matter of urgent public importance and of recect occurrence and if we have satisfied the provisions of the rules, you need not be guided by what the Minister says and what the Government says. You can straight away admit it and the whole thing can be discussed. Of course, subject to this: that any discussion that takes place here should not vitiate the proceedings elsewhere. One of please put forward by us is that judicial enquiry has to start forth with by the Government; in which case, all these things should be covered. So, I would like the Hon'ble Minister to reconsider his opinion. I would appeal to you to admit this adjournment motion and fix up a day for its discussion.

†Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—We do not know what is the matter that is before the Court and how that is going to affect the adjournment motion that is now to be discussed, if the Hon'ble Speaker is going to allow the adjournment motion. The cases are not against the persons who have opened fire; it is against somebody else as my friend who spoke before has urged. I think, that is the correct stand. I earnestly crave the indulgence of the Chair to mention that at least during the last five years, we had many occasions to discuss such

(SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA)

matters; we had occasions like the Budget discussion and the Governor's Address. But now we are in a situation where we have no Budget or Governor's Address to discuss; such opportunities are not before us; neither any other avenues are open to this Assembly to discuss this matter. In these ten years, there was only one similar adjournment motion, that is regarding the death of one Muniamma in Seshadripuram Police Station. That was the only adjournment motion which was allowed. As Law Minister, I think, you had also participated then. So, at the tail end of the five-year period of this Assembly, my earnest appeal to the Chair is that the Chair may make up its mind to permit this House to discuss these matters. Sri Ganji Veerappa, President of the District Congress Committee, has urged that there must be a judicial inquiry into the firing. An Hon'ble Member of the other House has also appealed for enquiry. If *prima facie*, there are all the ingredients required for allowing the adjournment motion, I appeal once again on that ground to allow the adjournment motion, because we have no other occasion to discuss this matter. We have no Budget before us at present. By giving a Calling Attention Notice, we can ot discuss the matter threadbear. To say that your predecessor did not give us a chance or yourself did not give us a chance is not a ground. I think the Adjournment Motion is covered by all the ingredients that are requiren in the Rules of Procedure. I do not say that you have no courage or boldness or...

Mr. SPEAKER.—There seems to be lurking fear in the mamber's mind and it is bursting out.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Please give us an opportunity to express ourselves by admitting it. Sri A. J. Doddameti has given a Call Attention Notice. Sri Ganji Veerappa has issued a Notice, and Sri Iyanahalli Doddaveerappa has said that it is Police high handedness.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let not the Hon'ble Member get into the facts and arguments of the case.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The required ingredients are there in the Adjournment Motion and it fullfils the Rule that is laid down. So, I appeal to the Hon'ble Chair to permit this House to discuss this matter and let the House take the decision in whatever manner it likes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I may mention for the information of the House that a repetition is not wanted for the purpose of impressing on me either by the same member or more members. I have a little power of understanding which makes me understand when a point is presented. If the Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa thinks that by repeating it greater momentum or persuation will come to my mind, there is no need for it. I catch the point to the extent possible.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾವು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರ ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಅಂದೋಳನದಿಂದ ಉದ್ಭವಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ

ನುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಎಂದಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಈಗ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಹಿರಿಯರ ದಾವಣಗೆರೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಇದು ಸಬ್‌ಜುಡೀಸ್ ಯಾವಾಗ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ತಾವೇ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಇನ್‌ಸಿಡೆಂಟ್ ಆದಾಗ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರೇ ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪುರುಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಏನು ಘಟನೆಯಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಮೊದಲು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಂಥಾದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಈ ಮನೆಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆ ಕೇಸುಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗದೆ ಇರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ರೂಲ್ 53 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಇದು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಬ್ ಜುಡೀಸ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ಹಕ್ಕು ಮತ್ತು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಮನಗಂಡು ನಾವು ಈ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಮಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರೂಲ್ 54ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರವೂ ತಾವು ಈ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಪ್ರಧಾನವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೇನೋ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ವಸ್ತು ಸಾರಾಂಶ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೇನೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ತರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಮಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಾದಾಗ ತಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೇನೂ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಮಾಡಿ ಆ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಇದೇ ತರಹ ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಪೋಲಿಸಿನವರ ಗೋಲ್ಮಾಲಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು ತುತ್ತಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಆ ಸಭೆಯು ನಡೆವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ಮುಂಚಾಂತರ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೇ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇವತ್ತು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪಾಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಡ್ಡ ಅಂತಕ ತಂದರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಿಲುವಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡ್ಲು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಹೋದರೂ ಕೂಡ ತಾವೇ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚನೆಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister for Home has raised an objection that it amounts to *subjudice*. I am thankful to the Hon'ble Speaker that he has conceded the urgency of the Adjournment Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I neither deserve nor require thanks.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, you have conceded straight away that all the conditions for the admission of the Adjournment Motion have been fulfiled. You have formed an idea to admit this Adjournment Motion. In the mean time, the Hon'ble Minister for Home is trying to prejudice your mind to change the opinion, which amounts to contempt.

(*Laughter*)

Even when a F. I. R. is sent to the Court, it does not amount to contempt of Court.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble member Sri Lakkappa will bear in mind that the Hon'ble Minister for Home stated, if I heared him right, first of all there was information, charge-sheet, cases registered—I am not going to gather all the facts.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, when you have once conceded with regard to the conditions for admission of the Adjournment Motion, you need not take any view that has been expressed which prejudice the opinion that has already been formed in your mind. My submission is that the Hon'bie Speaker may kindly admit it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಗಿರಿಯಪ್ಪ (ಕೋರಾರ).—ಈಗಿನ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯು ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೀಕರ ಆಹಾರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರಗಾಲ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೋರಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅನೇಕ ಜನರು ಉದ್ಯೋಗವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ತುಂಬಾ ತೊಂದರೆಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರುದ್ಯೋಗಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉದ್ಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿಫಲರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಹಾರಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳು ಸಿಗುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಅವನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಪೌಕರ್ಯ ಬೇರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ, ನಾನು ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a separate issue altogether. This may be take up in due time when I call upon the hon'ble member. Let me deal with the subject before us.

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Hon'ble Minister for Home said that cases have been registered and prosecutions have been lodged; but Against whom? Is it against persons responsible for firing? That is a different aspect altogether. There is no relevancy. Therefore, his contention that it amounts to *sub-judice*, is not tenable. You are the best Judge. As my friend, Sri S. M. Krishna pointed out, this is a first-class case, wherein there is relevancy. Of all the Motions that have been brought up, there is good sustance in this particular Motion and therefore, the Hon'ble Speaker may consider it favourably and provide an opportunity for the matter being discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble member Sri Krishna was pleased to state that it is prerogative under the circumstances which have been mentioned. If it is prerogative it should be something superior. So far as Mr. Lakkappa is concerned, he mentioned that the rules are there and conditions are there and the debate should automatically follow. The point is whether the resolution covers all the points or it covers only a portion of it or does not cover at all. Taking both that if it does not cover, there is no case—partly if it covers and should be allowed these things will have to be considered. The points mentioned by Sri Sivappa will have to be considered. Sri Sivappa has given one more notice. will he kindly read that for the information of House?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir it reads that the situation arising out of the State-wide Sathyagraha launched voluntarily by the people of Mysore State in respect of the Mysore Maharastra Border as a consequence of the proposal to set up one Man Commission to be taken into cosideration".

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think it is an urgent matter as I have already observed. Supreme importance should be given to it. The refore, I trust

the Government will have no objection for it. Not that I am insisting but I am only gathering the views.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—We are in the four corners of the orders of the Chair.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—We can take it up to-day, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may Collect his ideas and be prepared for tomorrow. Is it all right ?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—We can take it up tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will admit it to be taken up tommorrow, and the time will be allotted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಗಿರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಗಾಲ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದು ಆಹಾರವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಜನಗಳು ಸಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಮಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have mentioned it to his colleague who is a joint subscriber to that. If he wants me to consider, he has to modify it according to the rules and have discussion with the Secretary regarding that. I am unable to admit it as it is. I am rather helping him to bring the matter before the House.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Food).—I beg to lay :

(i) Notification No. RD 69 LCD 63dated 27th May, 1966, (Amendment to the Rules issued under the Coorg Land and Revenue Regulation 1899) as required under sub-Section (2) of Section 194 of the Mysore Land Revenue Act 1964.

(ii) Order No. 247 EST 65 dated 6th July 1966 (Remission of Stamp Duty Chargeable) as required under Sub-Section (2) of Section 9 of the Mysore Stamp Act, 1957.

(iii) Notification No. LMA 3 MLR 66 dated 24th June, 1966 [The Mysore Municipalities (Compounding of Offences) Rules, 1966] as required under Sub-section (6) of Section 323 of the Mysore Municipalities Act, 1964.

(iv) Notification No. HD 6 EBC 63 dated 30th June 1966 [The Mysore Prohibition (Excise Duties) (Amendment) Rules, 196...] as required under Section 125 of the Mysore Prohibition Act, 1961.

(v) Notification No. HD 107 TMT 65 dated 16th June, 1966, The Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation (I Amendment), Rules, 1966] as required under sub-section